DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 296 FL 007 818

AUTHOR Posner, R.
TITLE The Relevance of Comparative and Historical Data for the Description and Definition of a Language. York Papers in Linguistics; No. 6.
INSTITUTION York Univ. (England). Dept. of Language.
PUB DATE Mar 76
NOTE 14p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Contrastive Linguistics; Descriptive Linguistics; *Diachronic Linguistics; *Dialects; Etymology; Language Development; *Language Standardization; *Language Variation; Latin; *Morphology (Languages); Nonstandard Dialects; Regional Dialects; Romance Languages; Sociolinguistics; Transformation Generative Grammar

ABSTRACT

Sometimes descriptions of known facts about a language fail to be explanatory in a satisfying way, because they ignore parallelisms in related languages, including chronologically earlier stages of the same language. This article examines several Romance languages and dialects in terms of similarities in morphological evolutionary development. Consideration of comparative data indicates that the polarization of standards can overlay similar patterns of variation in different regions and that an explanatory description of nonstandard usage needs the added dimension offered by use of comparative and historical data. (Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125296

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE RELEVANCE OF COMPARATIVE AND HISTORICAL DATA FOR THE DESCRIPTION AND DEFINITION OF A LANGUAGE

R. Posner

What I want to exemplify is that sometimes descriptions of known facts about a language fail to be explanatory in a satisfying way, because they ignore parallelisms in related languages, including chronologically earlier stages of the same language. The data to be considered may not therefore be limited to that of a closely defined dialect, but may profitably embrace that of related dialects.

One difficulty lies in delimiting the language to be described: how much variation is to be admitted and how is it to be handled? The Romance languages provide an interesting field for speculation on this point. They form an obvious delimited set which for some purposes can be best considered as variants of one and the same entity, while for others they are better subdivided into clusters that are more or less loosely inter-related.

It is easy to fall into the trap of treating substandard uses as *necessarily* variations on the standard to which they are politically or culturally linked and which forms a model for most users (e.g. Spanish, French) while failing to recognize that parallel uses are to be found elsewhere in Romance and might conceivably be viewed as *Romance* variants rather than French or Spanish variants.

FL007818

It would be easiest to illustrate from phonology -- and indeed within the generativist framework differences between the Romance dialects are frequently assigned to surface phenomena with underlying phonological forms looking remarkably similar. *Now* I shall merely refer you to Posner (1975) in which I discuss persistent phonological rules (or meta-rules) which *could* account for certain parallelisms within Romance.

Illustrations from the field of lexical semantics are not infrequent in Romance studies, but more difficult to fit into the theme I have chosen. I shall merely refer to Posner (1974) and proceed to closer examination of two examples from the recent literature -- both primarily concerned with American Spanish nonstandard usage, one with morphology (Harris 1975) and the other with syntax (Lavandera 1975). The difference in approach of the two writers should be noted.

James Harris working in the M.I.T. generative phonology tradition treats New Mexican nonstandard as a separate entity which in the case discussed differs from Spanish by the generalization of certain rules that are specifically constrained in the standard.

Beatriz Lavandera, a pupil of Labov, treats the Buenos Aires nonstandard usage under consideration by means of a variable rule favoured by certain semantic and social factors.

Harris, in his work, gives us no indication of the relative frequency or of determining factors for nonstandard and standard use (though we know from other sources that they are far from watertight compartments) whereas

Lavandera, as a socio-linguist, is primarily concerned with these questions.

Harris's study concerns verb-forms in New Mexican nonstandard Spanish, which he calls 'Chicano' -- a very well documented variety since Espinosa's 1930 study.[1] Two (related?) features are discussed: stress assignment and the phonological form of the first person plural inflectional ending. The examples given are as follows:

	standard	*chicano*	*standard*	*chicano*
Pres indic	trabájo			
	trabájas			
	trabája	(same)		
	trabajámos			
	trabajáis			
	trabájan			
Pres subj	trabáje	trabáje	trabajémos	trabájenos
	trabájes	trabájes	pensémos	piénsenos
	trabáje	trabáje	comámos	cómanos
	trabajémos	*trabájenos*	durmámos	duérmanos
	trabajéis	(not used)	salgámos	sálganos
	trabájen	trabájen	vayámos	váyanos
			démos	démos
Imperf ind	trabajába		estémos	estémos [*sic*, not **éstenos*]
	trabajábas			
	trabajába	(same)		
	trabajábamos			
	trabajábais			
	trabajában			
Past subj	trabajára			
	trabajáras			
	trabajára	(same)		
	trabajáramos			
	trabajárais			
	trabajáran			

We should note several features of this dialect:

1. As in other American varieties there is no distinctive 2p.pl. form and the -V*mos* ending is the only two-syllable person inflection.

2. The -V*mos* 1p.pl. ending is stressed on the vowel only in the pres. ind. the preterite and the future. Of these the preterite is extensively used, as in most American Spanish; no information is given about the use of the future -- which is not a popular form in most American Spanish varieties. Unlike the standard, the pres. subj. paradigm is here always stem-stressed.

3. The 1p.pl. inflections of the pres. ind. and the weak pret. are shown as identical, as in the standard but not as in many American varieties. I shall not pursue this point further here but refer to Pullum (1975) and his appeal to transderivational constraints -- an apparently 'revolutionary' idea in generative grammar but a commonplace of traditional

Romance thinking, where numerous examples relevant to the present problem can be cited.[2]

4. Although the 1p.pl. inflection of the pres. ind. and weak pret. are identical, the stem is frequently differentiated, for Standard alternating *o/ue* and *e/ie* pres. ind. paradigms are frequently levelled in favour of the diphthong, with the effect that the diphthong is no longer derivable from an underlying simple vowel by a synchronic phonological rule mentioning a ⟨+stress⟩ feature.[3]

5. The ending *-nos* [nɔh] is used for *-mos* only when preceded by an unstressed syllable. Harris describes this in terms of a morphologically determined rule which changes *m* to *n*. He rejects the traditional, indeed the obvious, explanation of analogical influence of the personal pronoun *nos* because he sees no reason why such an influence should be exerted only after an unstressed syllable.

It is my concern to show that we expect this change precisely in these conditions. With this object I shall examine other Romance languages.

Turning first to the question of stress in the 1p.pl. endings, all Romance languages retain traces of Latin ˈ-Vmŭsˌ endings and nearly everywhere the dominant stress patterning (with the penultimate V stressed) has meant that this person has at some point in time been differentiated from the rest of the paradigm.[4] Analogical levelling of this ending is particularly evident (cf. French *-ons*, Italian *-iamo* generalized to many parts of the system) and popular usage often avoids the person-ending altogether (cf. French *on va*, Italian *noi si va*, Brazilian Portuguese *nois ama*, etc).

Leftward shift of the stress is common so that the stem is stressed throughout certain paradigms.[5] Such a shift is most common in the imperfect indicative and subjunctive (as in standard Spanish and much of Italy) with the present subjunctive also favouring rhizotonic forms (as in many Spanish, Portuguese and S.French dialects[6]). The present indicative more often resists the stress-shift: where it does take place, as in N.Italy, some Rheto-Romance dialects and S.E.France the 1p.pl. ending is often monosyllabic so that it is the surface penultimate syllable that is stressed. Most of these dialects do not use ending-stressed future or preterite forms. A conspiracy towards regular surface penultimate stress in verb paradigms can be suspected in such dialects.[7]

The tendency towards penultimate stress in Romance is so marked that apparent exceptions have received special attention from generativists like Foley (1965), Harris (1969) and Saltarelli (1972).[8] Harris 1969, while confessing bewilderment about possible *causes* described the Standard *trabajábamos/trabajáramos* antepenultimate stress as being determined by a morphological feature ⟨-perf⟩. In his 1975 article[9] he prefers the rules:

1. The vowel of the antepenultimate syllable is stressed if it is the *theme vowel* and if it is followed by a *two-syllable inflection* (eg. -Vmos).

2. Otherwise the vowel of the penultimate syllable is stressed.

3. The (only) vowel of monosyllabic forms is stressed.

Chicano differs from the Standard by generalizing Rule 1 so that ALL antepenultimate vowels are stressed if followed by a two-syllable inflection: this permits *trabáj-emos* but excludes **trabájamos* as the vowel in the *trabajámos* forms is *not part of the inflection but of the stem.*[10] But an added complication is that where there is antepenultimate stress *-nos* appears instead of *-mos*. If this were due to analogical influence by the personal pronoun ⌜NOS⌝, why does it occur only in conjunction with antepenultimate stress? Let me again briefly examine Romance parallels.

In most languages inter-influence between the pronoun and inflection is not detectable, though not necessarily absent, because of overlaying of other phonological developments. In S.W.France and N.E.Spain, and in central Italy however it is likely that the two morphemes have tended to fuse, with ⌜mus⌝ sometimes used for the pronoun (found also in S.E.France) and ⌜nos⌝ for the inflection. The latter use certainly seems to be favoured in stress-shifted forms[11] though some (more or less suspect) counter examples have been cited.[12] In O.Tuscan examples where the inflection *-no* appears alongside *-mo*[13] (the pronoun also being *no*) it is uncertain where the word-stress fell. The best documented examples (apart from Chicano) are those recorded for mountain Aragonese dialects in surveys dating from 1932 (by Kuhn) and 1944 (by Badía Margarit). There *-nos* endings often occur after an unstressed vowel.[14]

It is worth noting that in fact the *-nos* forms occur much more frequently in the 1932 data (for the locality Hecho) than in the 1944: eg.

Impf. ind. *haber* 1p.pl. Benasque *héban*/Hecho *hébanos*; 3p.pl. *héban* for both;
impf. subj. *hacer* 1p.pl. Benasque *fésan*/Hecho *fésanos*; 3p.pl. *fésan* for both;
impf. ind. *ser* 1p.pl. Benasque *yéran*/Hecho, Bielsa *yéranos*; 3p.pl. *yéran* for all.

These data suggest that the *-nos* may be a detachable suffix in dialects where final *-n* marks the plural.[15] The 1932 Hecho data with abundant *-nos* inflections are more neatly patterned than those collected in 1944 -- perhaps indicative of a chronologically anterior stage or perhaps an effect more of the preconceptions of the informant or investigator than of linguistic reality.

However scant and unreliable the evidence on this question, the data garnered from all parts of Romance can be pieced together to suggest

1. that the 1p.pl. is apt to be exceptional in the verbal paradigm but that otherwise

2. there is a tendency to uniformity within the paradigm -- a tendency most resisted in the pres. ind. -- and that

3. there is a tendency to simplify stress assignment rules in the direction of stressing the penultimate syllable.

Taken together, these otherwise sometimes contradictory tendencies may have

'conspired' towards the Chicano outcome. I suggest that Chicano paradigms tend to be regularized with stress on the penultimate syllable, that *-n* is used as a plural marker, and that the 1p.pl. person is additionally marked by an enclitic *nos* pronoun, which as a separable morpheme, does not affect the operation of the stress assignment rule. The 'irregular' forms are *not* thus those with *-nos* endings but those in which stress falls on the final syllable (discussed by Pullum 1975) and those in which the *-Vmos* endings are preserved -- perhaps easiest explained as an effect of historical intertia.

Harris himself, against his theoretical predilections, has been forced to recognize the potency of the tendency towards paradigmatic uniformity in his own study of Chicano diphthongs (Harris, forthcoming). Here too, the most obvious solution -- one paralleled in other Romance dialects -- may be the right one.

* * * * * *

Lavandera's excellent dissertation is concerned with a socially marked usage of Buenos Aires speech in which a so-called 'conditional' form ⌜-RÍA⌝ [17] is used where the standard requires a so-called 'imperfect subjunctive' ⌜-RA⌝ or ⌜-SE⌝.[18] On the basis of her sociolinguistic investigations Lavandera posits a variable rule:

$$\text{IMPF} \rightarrow \langle \text{COND} \rangle \;/\; \underset{si}{\underline{\qquad\qquad}} \begin{bmatrix} +\text{HYP} \\ +\text{VERB} \\ -\text{PAST} \end{bmatrix} \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} \alpha\text{CONTR} \\ \alpha\text{NEG} \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle,$$

(Not found for lexical items *ser, haber, querer*; favoured by factors: low educational status, middle-age, female)

(i.e. imperfect subjunctive $\left\{\begin{matrix}\text{⌜-SE⌝} \\ \text{⌜-RA⌝}\end{matrix}\right\}$ becomes conditional (⌜-RÍA⌝) in hypothetical clauses with a verb referring to non-past time determined by alpha variables 'contrary to fact' and 'negative' where either both are + or both -).[19] Moreover she finds that among those speakers who never use the ⌜-RÍA⌝ forms -- especially the younger better educated males -- a non-standard but non-stigmatized present indicative form is often used[20] suggesting disfavour for the ⌜-RA⌝ or ⌜-SE⌝ forms but consciousness that the ⌜-RÍA⌝ forms are not socially acceptable.

Although Lavandera suggests that ⌜-SE⌝ and ⌜-RA⌝ are equivalent, we should note that in this dialect, as in most American dialects and popular metropolitan Castilian, ⌜-RA⌝ forms are more frequent, though ⌜-SE⌝ is generally (if rarely) used, apparently as a slightly 'posh' equivalent of ⌜-RA⌝ in all contexts, being favoured by *haber* as an auxiliary: e.g. *hubiese tomado*. It is therefore fair to assume, as Lavandera herself does at one point, that ⌜-RÍA⌝ is substituting for ⌜-RA⌝ rather than ⌜-SE⌝.[21]

A look at other Romance languages reveals certain parallelisms:

1. The ⌜-RA⌝ type forms have at one time or another been used as a conditional in virtually all the Romance languages (Togeby 1966). In some it is still rivalled by the ⌜-SE⌝ subjunctive (used in Latin), in others by the imperfect indicative (but usually to

minimize the unreality of the con[illegible]tion) and also by the ⌜-RÍA⌝ conditional -- a Romance formation closely linked with the ⌜-RÉ⌝ future which Rohlfs (1922) saw as a French innovation that spread unevenly to Spain and Italy but was never adopted into many popular dialects.

2. Latin ⌜SI⌝ as the conditional conjunction has survived in all Romance languages although other devices are also used. In Daco-Rumanian *să* has come to have more general subordinating functions and *dacă* is the specifically conditional conjunction.

3. ⌜SI⌝ can be viewed as an underlying abstract verb governing the verb-form appropriate for indirect speech (Rivero 1972; Wagner 1936).[22] Whereas in earlier times this was frequently the ⌜-SE⌝ subjunctive for past reference, more innovating dialects have preferred the imperfect indicative, or, where the neutrality of the speaker is emphasized, the ⌜-RA⌝ or ⌜-RÍA⌝ conditionals.

4. The ⌜-RÍA⌝ conditional, morphologically more regular, has ousted the ⌜-RA⌝ conditional in the more innovating dialects. No historical trace of the ⌜-RA⌝ conditional is to be found in Tuscan, N.Italian and Rheto-Romance, in which dialects ⌜-SE⌝ subjunctives are found in unreal ⌜SI⌝ hypothetical clauses.

5. The history of unreal conditions in mediaeval Spanish is well-documented and much discussed (Mendeloff 1960; Green 1972; Harris 1971, 1972). In these as in other contexts the ⌜-RA⌝ forms become virtually stylistic variants of the ⌜-SE⌝ forms, whereas elsewhere there was no discernible difference between the ⌜-RA⌝ and the ⌜-RÍA⌝ forms (Spaulding 1929). Like other languages Spanish tends to parallelism in the protasis and apodosis, so that in both clauses the same verb-form is used: some dialects (e.g. Puerto Rican) use ⌜-RA⌝ in both; others (e.g. Buenos Aires) use ⌜-RÍA⌝ in both.

Similar developments have taken place elsewhere -- in popular French the ⌜-RÍA⌝ conditional is used in both clauses, a usage attested from early times (Renchon 1969);[23] in several Italian dialects either two imperfect indicatives *or* two ⌜-RÍA⌝ conditionals are used; in popular Portuguese and in Balkan Judeo-Spanish and popular insular Spanish two imperfect indicatives are preferred. In those areas where the ⌜-SE⌝ subjunctive is used for unreal conditions, again both clauses contain similar verb-forms (e.g. S.Italy, Lombardy, Rheto-Romance). A similar parallelism is to be found in languages where periphrastic verb-forms are used (e.g. Rumanian, Sardinian).[24]

Catalan is perhaps the odd man out here, as popular usage prefers a ⌜SI...-SE, ...-RÍA⌝ construction like that of standard Spanish, while correct usage is closer to standard French and Old Occitan. The socio-linguistic situation of Catalan no doubt accounts for the anomaly to some degree.

By and large though, popular tendencies are clear. What Lavandera needs then is not a variable rule that will transform the ⌜-RA⌝ / ⌜-SE⌝ form to ⌜-RÍA⌝ but a framework that will incorporate recognition of a Romance trend towards parallelism in the protasis and apodosis, and rivalry between the old ⌜-RA⌝ conditionals and the new ⌜-RÍA⌝ conditionals.

In citing these examples, I should emphasize that I do *not* maintain that these developments are Proto-Romance, *nor* that one dialect has influenced another. But that does not mean that, like Harris, I want to say they are *independent* of one another. Rather, I suggest that variation has always been possible within Romance but that some language communities resist it more than others.

To explain the choices of *standard* uses in different areas is perhaps one of the prime problems of Romance linguistics; undoubtedly sociolinguistic factors are of paramount importance though chance has also a part to play. What consideration of comparative data can teach us is that the polarization of standards can overlay similar patterns of variation in the different regions and that an *explanatory* description of nonstandard usage needs the added dimension offered by use of comparative and historical data.

NOTES

1. I have not yet been able to consult Hernandez (1975) which I understand to be mainly composed of previously published works on the subject.

2. In those Romance languages where the preterite is popularly used, a distinctive 1p.pl. form has often been adopted thus avoiding homonymy with the present indicative (e.g. American Span. and Ptg. use *-ámos* for 1 conj. preterites; Rum. and Occitan use a ⌜Vr⌝ infix in the preterite; standard Ptg. 1 conj. uses [ɐmuʃ] for the pres., [amuʃ] for the pret. etc).

3. Harris 1973 cites *vuelámos* pr. ind. (standard *volámos*) as current, while attested *piensámos* (st. *pensámos*) is, he believes, not usual among young adults.

4. Rumanian alone retains the Latin distinction between conjugation 3 ('-V̆mus) and the rest (-'V̄mus): *vedém / scrîem*: though traces of irregular reduced forms are to be found (e.g. FĂCĬMUS > *hémos, faimes.*) Mussafia 1883:4 declares of the stress alternation pattern in the pr. ind. paradigm 'Diesen Unterschied zu verwischen bestrebt sich ebenfalls der romanische Sprachgenius'. He demonstrates that the widespread use of the inchoative infix -ĬSC- often results in uniformity of stress patterning.

5. The future and weak preterite endings are usually stressed throughout the paradigm. Note that these forms are not in popular usage in many regions.

6. For Spanish cf. especially Alonso 1930. In E.France an ⌜EJ⌝ infix of uncertain origin is uniformly stressed throughout the paradigm. Note that sometimes in Romance the 1p.pl. is stem-stressed while the 2p.pl. is ending-stressed: Andaluz *sálgamos / salgáis* (Mondéjar 1970); Lombard *pŏrtem, tẽgnem / portè, tegnè* (but imperative *portèm, tegnèm*); Fr.Swiss *plyáron / plyorâde* (Mussafia 1883).

7. Where stress falls on the *final* surface syllable, as in French, it is possible to argue that this is an underlying penultimate syllable in forms where inflections may or may not be spelt out.

8. Some languages use stress to differentiate one form from another: cf. Pullum 1975; also e.g. Gascon 1p.pl. pres. subj. *pẽrden* / pres. ind. *perdẽn* (Kelly 1973); Aragonese pres. subj. 1p.pl. *diguẽn* / 3p.pl. *dĩguen* (Badía 1947).

9. The rules are formalized thus:

a	Theme V → [+stress]/[[...S]-S -S]		*standard*
	V → [+stress]/[[...S]-S -S]		*chicano*
b		/[...S -S]	*both*
c		/[S]	*both*

or, more discursively,

STANDARD

a The vowel of the antepenultimate syllable is stressed if it is the theme vowel and is followed by a two-syllable inflection (S = 'syllable'):
Theme V → [+stress]/[[...S] - S - S]$_{Verb}$
Examples: *trabajÁ-ba-mos, trabajÁ-ra-mos*

b Otherwise, the vowel of the penultimate syllable is stressed:
V → [+stress]/[...S - S]$_{Verb}$
Examples: *trabajÁ-mos, trabajÉ-mos, trabÁ-ja, trabÁ-jes*

c The (only) vowel of monosyllabic forms is stressed:
V → [+stress]/[S]$_{Verb}$
Examples: *sÉ, hÁn, dÁ, dÉ, vÁs, sÓy*

CHICANO

a The vowel of the antepenultimate syllable is stressed (whether or not it is the theme vowel) if it is followed by a two-syllable inflection:
V → [+stress]/[[...S] - S - S]$_{Verb}$
Examples: *trabÁjenos* ([trabaj] + e + nos])
trabajÁbanos ([[trabaj + a] + ba + nos])

b Same as standard b., e.g. *trabajÁmos* ([[trabaj + a] + mos])

c Same as standard c.

10. A simplified version of Harris's suggestion runs as follows:

The morphological structure of finite verb forms in Spanish can be presented schematically:

R = root TMA = tense-mood-aspect morpheme
TV = theme vowel PN = person-number morpheme
S = stem V = verb

$[[R + TV]_S + TMA + PN]_V$

The theme vowel does not appear in the surface representations

of certain forms because it is deleted by the morphological rule of Truncation, which can be stated for present purposes as:

$$[[...\text{Theme V}] + \text{V} ...]_{\substack{\text{Verb} \\ [-\text{past}]}} \rightarrow \emptyset$$

Examples of the operation of this rule are:

1 sing. pres. ind.	1 pl. pres. subj.
[[trabaj + a] + o]	[[trabaj + a] + e + mos]
↓	↓
trabaj Ø + *o*	*trabaj* Ø + *e* + *mos*

Incidentally, the *estémos* form is explained as not having epenthetic *e* in the systematic phonemic representation when stress assignment takes place. Note that non-standard Spanish sometimes omits the 1st syllable: *ta* for *está*, *taba* for *estaba* etc. (e.g. Navarro 1948).

11. This is so not only in American Spanish (e.g. Rosenblat 1946:221; Navarro 1948:127) but also in Spain (e.g. for Leonese, Alonso Garrote, 1947:79).

12. Rosenblat (1946:222) quotes Vizcayan *henos* for *hemos* from a description of 1892. García de Diego (1959:165) quotes *topabános* for Asturian, alongside *ṫbanos*, *tábanos*. Zamora Vicente (1967) *seems* to suggest that *parabánus* and *andabánus* are used in Leonese in the Órbigo region: this information has been inserted only in his second edition and the reference is obscure. I have so far found no independent evidence of such forms.

13. The connection between Tuscan (and standard) 3p.pl. *-Vno* ending, of uncertain origin, and the Old Tuscan apparently homophonous 1p. pl. ending is obscure. The *-no* 1p.pl. ending survives in some Tuscan dialectal speech: in Lucchese in the pres. indic. the accent falls on the surface penultimate, *-éno*, in the 1p.pl. and on the antepenultimate in the 3p. pl. *-ono*; the imperf. ind. contrasts 1p.pl. *-ávimo* with 3p.pl. *-ávino* etc. Pieri (1886) suggests that 1p.pl. *-no* is an enclitic personal pronoun attached to an apocopated form: i.e. *facciamo* > *facciam* > *facciano*.

14. The dialect of isolated Bielsa constitutes an apparent exception. Badía's 1944 investigation of Aragonese was followed in 1947 by a more intensive one of this dialect, which at that time was spoken habitually only by the old, with middle-aged people using Castilian lexicon with dialectal morphology in their dialect speech (the young had only passive knowledge). The dialect had been in contact with Castilian only since 1920: the villages had been destroyed and the population evacuated to France during the Civil War but all had returned and the population numbered some 800 at the time of Badía's investigation. The proparoxytonic 1p.pl. forms are found only in irregular verbs: *ṫbanos* (imperf. ind. *ir*); *hébanos* (imperf. ind. *haber*); *yéranos* (imperf. ind. *ser*) / imperf. subj. *ṫnos*, *hénos*, *fuénos*. Otherwise the 1p.pl. imperf. ind. and imperf. subj. forms are

identical, with penultimate stress: *sacámos, metémos, partímos* etc. The *-nos* ending regularly appears in this ending and nowhere else (cf. e.g. pres. ind. *sacámos, metémos, partímos*; pret. and pres.subj. *saquémos; metiémos / metiámos; partiémos / partiámos*. A generativist would have no difficulty in explaining e.g. *sacámos* as a surface form matching underlying imperf. ind. /sacábanos/ (cf. *sacáb-* in the rest of the paradigm) and imperf. subj. /sacásanos/ (cf. *sacás-* likewise). What is extraordinary about Badía's data is that they show amazing homogeneity: the variant *hábamos* is registered once for imperf. ind. *hébanos* and occasionally *tenían* is found for imperf. ind. *tenénos*. Badía concludes that *-nos* is a mark of the imperfect, maintained with great consistency by *los belsetanes viejos*. It does not appear to be linked to surface stress, which is uniformly placed on the penultimate syllable except in the pret. fut. and cond. singular and 2p.pl., and in the 2p.pl. pres. ind. It is to be noted that Badía says the stress is strong and that syncope of unstressed vowels is frequent, and also that Castilian proparoxytons often appear as paroxytons, though with a good deal of vacillation.

15. At Benasque the imperf. ind. and subj. 1 sg. *-a* and 3 sg. *-e* are matched by 1p.pl. *-an* and 3p.pl. *-en* in many verbs.

16. Kuhn (1935) used as his informant for Hecho a 35-year-old 'maestro nacional y oficial 1° de la Secretaría del Ayuntamiento de Hecho'. Most of his other informants were in the 50-60 age group, with occupation designated 'labrador'. Apart from the frequent Hecho use of *-nos* in the imperf. ind. and subj. Kuhn quotes only one example from another locality: *tenéβanos* at Torla where the informant was a 77-year-old shepherd.

17. E.g. *Pienso que si yo estaría en algún apuro como si un vecino mío estaría en un apuro, haría lo imposible por salvarlo* 'I think that if I were in a spot of trouble just as if one of my neighbours were in a spot of trouble, I would do the impossible to save him.' *Si tuviera dinero y podría [pudiera] comprar una casa, sería muy feliz.* (Cf. *Si tuviera ... podría ... y sería...*) 'If I had money and could buy a house, I'd be very happy.

18. I use the labels ⌜-RA⌝ ⌜-SE⌝ and ⌜-RÍA⌝ referring to cognate forms in other languages.

(AMAV)⌜-ERAT⌝ pluperf. ind.	→	⌜-RA⌝ conditional
(AMAV)⌜-ISSET⌝ plup. subj.	→	⌜-SE⌝ subj.
Future stem + past ending	→	⌜-RÍA⌝ conditional

19. E.g. *¿Si yo no creería en Dios, qué hago?*

$$\left\langle \begin{matrix} +\text{CONTR} \\ +\text{NEG} \end{matrix} \right\rangle$$

(cf.fn 17) *Si yo estaría...*

$$\left\langle \begin{matrix} -\text{CONTR} \\ -\text{NEG} \end{matrix} \right\rangle$$

20. E.g. (pres. ind.) *Si me ofrecen un sueldo de 400.000 pesos, ahora lo aceptaría* 'If I were offered 400.000 pesos pay, then I'd accept.'

21. Similar usage is attested in Spain. Espinosa 1930b points out that it is frequent in the popular speech of Burgos.

22. For 'unreal' conditions Green (1972:84) on the other hand suggests that it is the protasis that is governed by an abstract verb [COND] (e.g. [I think probable that]$_{COMP}$). If *both* clauses were seen to be governed by abstract verbs, e.g.

[let us imagine]$_{COMP}$ .....[we conclude / expect / suppose etc]$_{COMP}$

it would be easier to understand the parallelism of treatment. The unreal conditional sentence is surely unlike other complex sentences in that the apodosis can be considered a 'main clause' or 'matrix sentence' only by straining its semantics. It is perhaps better viewed as a kind of co-ordinated sentence. However we must always bear in mind that the 'unreal condition' label covers a host of semantic sins (cf. e.g. Nutting 1925).

23. The use of the imperfect indicative in standard French unreal *si* clauses has sometimes been ascribed to Occitan influence. Old Provençal certainly showed a preference for it though the ⌜-RÍA⌝ form is very occasionally found even in the literary language--curiously enough, especially in Italian troubadours' work (Henrichsen 1955). However, modern dialects sometimes show preference for the ⌜-RÍA⌝ form: Gévaudan, cf. Camproux 1954; for modern Occitan in general, cf. Lafont 1967 ('not unknown'). Use of the ⌜-RÍA⌝ *-rait* form in French is often, incomprehensibly, ascribed to interference from another language -- in Canada, to English; in North Africa, to Spanish, and in Belgium, to Flemish (similar usage in New York City English is often said to be due to Yiddish influence, equally incomprehensibly). That Sardinians speaking Italian use similar forms can be linked to the Sardinian dialect use of parallel periphrastic conditionals in both protasis and apodosis, but the use is attested also in other Italian regional forms.

24. It is to be noted that even in languages where parallelism is not standard for *si*-conditions, where *si* is not used a parallelism is permitted: e.g. *Vous auriez un moment que je vous expliquerais tout.* García de Diego 1950 suggests that the tendency towards rhythmic parallelism in conditional sentences is universal. Wagner 1939 sees the tendency as an intrusion of logic into grammatical usage.

REFERENCES

Alonso, A. (1930) 'Cambios acentuales', *BDH*, 1.

Alonso Garrote, S. (1947) *El dialecto vulgar leonés hablado en Maragateria y Tierra de Astorga.* Madrid, CSIC.

Badía Margarit, A. (1947) 'Sobre morfología dialectal aragonesa', *BRABLB*, 20:57-123.

Badía Margarit, A. (1950) *El habla del valle de Bielsa*. Barcelona, CSIC.
(1962) *Gramática catalana*. ii Madrid, Gredos.

Camproux, C. (1954) *Etude syntaxique des parlers gévaudanais*. Paris, PUF.

Casagrande, J.& (eds 1972) *Generative Studies in the Romance Languages*.
Saciuk, B. Rowley (Mass), Newbury House.

Espinosa, A.M. (1930, 1946) 'Estudios sobre el español de Nuevo Méjico', *BDH*, 1:23-280, 2:3-105.
(1930b) 'The Use of the Conditional for the Subjunctive in Castilian Popular Speech', *MPhil*, 27:445-9.

Foley, J.A. (1965) *Spanish Morphology*. MIT, unpubl. diss.

García de Diego, V. (1950) 'La uniformación rítmica en las oraciones condicionales', in *Estudios dedicados a D. Ramón Menéndez Pidal*. Madrid, CSIC. pp.95-107.
(1959) *Manual de dialectología española*. Madrid, Cultura Hispánica.

Green, J.N. (1972) 'Spanish Conditionals: Systems or Rules?' *ArL*, 3:75-85.

Harris, J.W. (1969) *Spanish Phonology*. Cambridge (Mass), MIT Press.
(1975) 'Morphological Change and Generative Grammar', *RPh*, 27:535-45.
(forthcoming) 'Morphologization of Phonological Rules: an example from Chicano Spanish', paper read at 3rd Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, Indiana University, 1973.

Harris, M.B. (1971) 'The History of the Conditional Complex from Latin to Spanish: Some Structural Considerations', *ArL*, 2:25-33.
(1972) 'Systems or Rules: a False Dichotomy', *ArL*, 3:87-95.

Henrichsen, A.-J. (1955) *Les Phrases hypothétiques en ancien occitan. Etude syntaxique*. Bergen U.P.

Hernández, E. (*et al.* eds 1975) *El lenguaje de los Chicanos*. Arlington, CAL.

Kelly, R.C. (1973) *A Descriptive Analysis of Gascon*. The Hague, Mouton.

Kuhn, A. (1935) 'Der hocharagonesische Dialekt', *RLiR*, 11:1-312.

Lafont, R. (1967) *La Phrase occitane*. Paris, PUF.

Lavandera, B.R. (1975) *Linguistic Structure and Sociolinguistic Conditioning in the Use of Verbal Tenses in SI-clauses. (Buenos Aires Spanish)*. Pennsylvania, unpubl. diss.

Mendeloff, H. (1960) *The Evolution of the Conditional Sentence Contrary to Fact in Old Spanish*. Washington D.C., Catholic University.

Mondéjar, J. (1970) *El verbo andaluz*. Madrid.

Mussafia, A. (1883) *Zur Präsensbildung im Romanischen*. Vienna, Kais. Ak.

Navarro, T. (1948) *El español en Puerto Rico*. Puerto Rico U.P.

Nazario, M.A. (1957) *El arcaísmo vulgar en el español de Puerto Rico*. Mayagüez.

Nutting, H.C. (1925) *The Latin Conditional Sentence*. Berkeley, California U.P.

Pieri, S. (1886) 'Il verbo aretino e lucchese' in *Misc. Caix-Canello*. Florence, Le Monnier, pp. 304-11.

Posner, R. (1974) 'Homonymy, Polysemy and Semantic Change', *LSci*, 27.
(1975) 'The Ordering of Historical Phonological Rules in Romance', to appear in *TPS*.

Pullum, G. (1975) 'On Linguistically Insignificant Generalizations', *YPL*, 5:97-109.

Renchon, H. (1969) *Etudes de syntaxe descriptive* i: *La conjonction si et l'emploi des formes verbales*. Brussels, Palais des Académies.

Rivero, M.-L. (1972) 'On Conditionals in Spanish', in Casagrande and Saciuk 1972:196-224.

Rohlfs, G. (1922) 'Das romanische *habeo*-Futurum und Konditionalis', *AR*, 6:105-154.

Rosenblat, A. (1946) 'Notas de morfología dialectal', *BDH*, 1946:103-316.

Saltarelli, M. (1972) 'Italian *qua* Neo-Latin', in Casagrande and Saciuk 1972:317-330.

Spaulding, R.K. (1929) 'An Inexact Analogy. The *-ra* form as a substitute for the *-ría*', *Hispania*, 12:371-6.

Tekavčic, P. (1972) *Grammatica storica dell'italiano*. Bologna, Mulino.

Togeby, K. (1966) 'Le Sort du plus-que-parfait latin dans les langues romanes', *CFS*, 23:175-84.

Wagner, R.L. (1936) 'Une Loi d'équilibre en français', *FM*, 4:290-310.

(1939) *Les Phrases hypothétiques commençant par SI dans la langue française des origines à la fin du XVI^e siècle*. Paris, Droz.

Zamora Vicente, A. (1967) *Dialectología española*. Madrid, Gredos.